

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/844,662	04/27/2001	Eva Raschke	8325-0012	9004
20855 ROBINS & PA	7590 09/12/2007 ASTERNAK	EXAMINER		
1731 EMBAR	CADERO ROAD	BRUSCA, JOHN S		
SUITE 230 PALO ALTO,	CA 94303		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1112011210,	,		1631	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/12/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/844,662	RASCHKE ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
John S. Brusca	1631	

	John S. Brusca	1631	1			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED <u>27 August 2007</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AI	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.				
. Me The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in c	idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)			
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	e of the final rejection.					
The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN						
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7 extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date		26(a) and the approprie	to outonaion foo			
nave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extender 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the etforth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b)	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Office	iate extension fee ice action; or (2) as			
NOTICE OF APPEAL The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any external a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed.	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of ne appeal. Since			
AMENDMENTS	house mains at the state of filing a brief	will not be automed by				
∴ Me proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because (a) Me They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) Me They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);						
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or	• •	ducing or simplifying	the issues for			
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a		ected claims.				
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1	• • •					
The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).			
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)		Alaraha Elad amandara	Al Al			
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s). 	•	•	•			
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		ll be entered and an	explanation of			
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 57,63,64,66,68-71 and 87-90. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
B. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).						
The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a			
10. \square The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	on of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attac	hed.			
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	lored but does NOT along the appli	aatian in aanditian fa-	. allawanaa			
11. The request for reconsideration has been consideration because:	lered but does NOT place the appli	cation in condition for	allowance			
See Continuation Sheet.	(DTO(CD(00) Department)					
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).13. Other:	(F10/56/06) Paper NO(S)					
		/John S. Brusca/				
		Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1631				

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The proposed amendment to "non-naturally occurring" exogenous molecules would be a new limitation that requires further search and consideration for new matter. The proposes limitation "within a cell" would be a new limitation that requires further search..

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The applicants point to originally filed claim 53 for support for the proposed amendment but originally filed claim 53 does not appear to be relevant to the proposed amendment. The applicants point to the specification at page 10, lines 7-9, but this passage does not limit cellular chromatin to being within an intact cell and also does not appear to be relevant to the proposed amendment. The arguments regarding the outstanding rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, and 103 are based upon entry of the proposed amendment and are therefore not persuasive in view of the non-entry of the proposed amendment.